UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,049	01/18/2001	Gavin Brebner	B-4084 618514-1	7680

22879   7590   10/01/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on July 11, 2007 with respect to claims 1-19 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response filed applicant argues in substance that:

a.   Revashetti does not teach or suggest "creating in the user's computer at least one profile file comprising at least one of the data selected from the group consisting of private data owned by the user and data regarding the technical specifications of the user's computer"...The user profile is therefore created on the service provider computer system, not the user's computer (remarks, pg. 11-12).

In response to argument [a], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Revashetti teaches "at step 304, the client computer connects to a web site located on the service provider computer system...Optionally, the user of the client computer completes a user profile at step 306...**Alternatively, the user profile may comprise a series of questions designed to elicit further stated preferences information from the user of the client computer**, such as user address, phone number, ZIP code, and the like..." (emphasis added) (col. 7 L58 to col. 8 L15).

At column 14 lines 9-39, Revashetti discloses "In another embodiment, the user profile comprises a series of questions designed to elicit further stated preferences information from the user of the client computer..."

The fact that the user of the client computer completes a user profile logically teaches that the user profile is created in and/or at the user's computer.

Also note that the fact that "the user profiles or relevant elements thereof are optionally downloaded to the client computer for use by..." does not mean that the user profile is not created in the user's computer simply because the claim merely refers to the creation of the profile in or at the user's computer.

The "creation" could be implemented through a service provider and/or through a wizard program from the service provider's web site. Utilizing the wizard and/or service providers web site by the user, more specifically, at the user's computer, in order to create the user profile is equivalent to creating the user profile in the user's computer because the user profile is generated at and/or in the user's computer and displayed in the user's computer.

In the teachings above, the user explicitly, through the user computer, defines the content of the user profile by answering the series of questions. In other words, the user profile is created in or at the user's computer.

Secondly, as set forth in the claim 1 and claim 9, the user profile comprises private data owned by the user (i.e. data related to the user) and data regarding the technical specifications of the user's computer.

Revashetti discloses the process of creating **an inventory database file** that comprises data belonging to the user such as software data, and the technical specifications of the user's computer, by executing the scan method in the user's computer (col. 8 L52 to col. 9 L12, col. 14 L40 to col. 15 L60 and fig. 7) (emphasis added).

In other words, the inventory database file above can simply be interpreted as the user's profile as the file comprises private data owned by the user and the technical specifications of the user's computer, which is clearly created in the user's computer through the execution of the scan method.

b. Revashetti also does not teach "applying in the user's computer the matching rules in the offer file to the profile file in order to select one or more services from the offer file, wherein no information from the at least one profile file is exported from the user's computer" (remarks, pg. 12).

In response to argument [b], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Revashetti, at column 8 line 52 to column 9 line 12, clearly discloses: "In a preferred embodiment, the inventory database remains on the client computer and is not transmitted across the network to a receiving computer system in order to preserve the privacy of the user".

Furthermore, Revashetti teaches applying in the user's computer the matching rules in the downloaded product file to the inventory file in order to select services for presentation (See col. 9 L12 to col. 10 L24).

c.   In Revashetti, the information for the user profile is exported from the clients

computer to the service provider computer system for creation of the user profile, as

discussed above. As noted in the specification of the instant application, an object

accomplished by the disclosed process is to carry out customer targeting without

exporting any information from the user's computer (remarks, pg. 12).

In response to applicant statement above, it should also be noted that the specification of

instant application also discloses "In one embodiment, however, it may be useful to reduce the

size of the information that is exchanged between the agent module and the server, by exporting

a very limited range of data that is contained into the profile file…(specification, pg. 12 lines 25-

30).

Therefore, applicant's argument directed towards the distinction between the prior art and

the claimed invention based on the features above is considered not persuasive for the reasons set

forth above. The rejection is maintained.

Specification

The objection presented in the previous office action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph rejection presented in the previous office

action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Revashetti et al. (hereinafter Revashatti, US 6,230,199 B1) in view of Ball et al. (hereinafter ·

Ball, US 5,860,071).

As per claim 1, Revashetti discloses a process for personalized access to information

available on the Internet network (col. 3 L11 to col. 4 L55), comprising:

Creating, in the user's computer at least one profile file containing private data owned by

the user, and data regarding the technical specifications of the user's computer (i.e. a file

containing the disclosed data, col. 5 L50 to col. 6 L54, col. 7 L40 to col. 8 L64, col. 10 L45-63,

col. 14 L40-67, col. 15 L9-60: inventory database file contains the private data and the technical

data);

repeatedly initiating a download from service provider in order to receive an offer file

containing matching rules for matching services accessible via the Internet to said at least one

profile (col. 5 L54 to col. 6 L54, col. 7 L15-35, col. 10 L45-63);

applying in the user's computer the matching rules in the offer file to the profile in order

to select one or more services from the offer file, wherein no information from at the least one

profile file is exported from the user's computer (col. 5 L50 to col. 6 L63, col. 7 L1-35, col. 8

L52 to col. 9 L12: no information from the inventory database is transmitted to the network, col. 9 L12 to col. 10 L24, col. 19 L35 to col. 20 L14);

generating in the user's computer the code of a HTML page describing only said selected services (col. 6 L64 to col. 7 L67: user connects to a web site located at service provider, col. 9 L65 to col. 10 L24, col. 20 L15-33, col. 5 L54-60: the client is connected to the service provider and vendors through Internet utilizing http and html for accessing and presenting information); and

pushing said HTML page code into a web browser in the user's computer for permitting direct access to the services selected (col. 6 L64 to col. 7 L67 and fig. 13, col. 9 L65 to col. 10 L24, col. 20 L45 to col. 21 L8, fig. 2 and col. 5 L54-60: the client is connected to the service provider and vendors through Internet utilizing http and html for accessing and presenting information).

However, Revashatti does not disclose a process of repeatedly polling from the user's computer a service provider.

Ball, explicitly teaches the process of repeatedly polling a service provider from a user's computer (col. 5 L64-67, col. 6 L1-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Revashatti in view of Ball in order to repeatedly poll the service provider in order to retrieve the file.

One of ordinary skilled in the art at the time would have been motivated because the mechanism would have checked for updates (Ball, col. 6 L17-24).

As per claim 2, Revashatti discloses the process of creating and updating a local file containing the selected services (col. 6 L64 to col. 7 L35 and fig. 13, col. 9 L65 to col. 10 L24, col. 20 L45 to col. 21 L8, col. 22 L46 to col. 23 L67).

As per claim 3, Revashatti in view of Ball discloses the process wherein polling is executed after a predetermined period (Ball: col. 5 L64-67, col. 6 L1-23) and when the user requests the establishment of an Internet connection (Revashatti: col. 2 L50-64, col. 22 L46 to col. 23 L67).

As per claim 5, Revashatti discloses the process wherein said at least one profile contains private data regarding the user and technical data relating to the user's computer (col. 5 L50 to col. 6 L54, col. 7 L40 to col. 8 L64, col. 10 L45-63, col. 14 L8-39).

As per claim 6, Revashatti discloses the process wherein said at least one profile contains technical data that is automatically collected by means of an analysis software program (col. 5 L50 to col. 6 L67, col. 7 L40 to col. 8 L64, col. 10 L45-63, col. 14 L8-39).

As per claim 7, Revashatti discloses the process wherein it is used for achieving an e-business application (fig. 1, col. 2 L50-64, col. 3 L10 to col. 4 L54).

As per claim 12, Revashatti discloses the process wherein the HTML page is generated at the user's computer in response to the occurrence of predetermined conditions (col. 5 L54 to col. 7 L36, col. 7 L40-67, col. 9 L54 to col. 10 L24: the process of filtering and presenting the advertisements are with respect to client's computer, i.e. are performed in the client's computer in response to a predetermined condition, which is the initiation of the internet connection to the web site, col. 20 L45 to col. 21 L8, col. 21 L63 to col. 22 L11).

As per claims 8-11 and 13, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12.

2.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Revashetti et al. (hereinafter Revashatti, US 6,230,199 B1) in view of Ball et al. (hereinafter Ball, US 5,860,071), and further in view of Dedrick (US 5,710,884).

As per claim 4, Revashatti and Ball do not disclose the process wherein the profile is encrypted into said local user machine.

Dedrick, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of encrypting profiles into user's machine, i.e. computer (col. 6 L22 to col. 7 L8).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Revashatti and Ball in view of Dedrick in order to encrypt the user profile into user machine.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have protected the information in a profile from access by anyone other than the individual who is associated with the information, i.e. the owner (See Dedrick, col. 6 L22-60).

3.   Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Revashetti

et al. (hereinafter Revashatti, US 6,230,199 B1) in view of Ball et al. (hereinafter Ball, US

5,860,071), and further in view of Sundaresan (US 6,487,566 B1).

As per claim 14, Revashatti in view of Ball does not disclose the process wherein at least

one profile is a XML file stored on the user's computer.

Sundaresan, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of pattern

matching and transforming documents (col. 4 L29-40), wherein the content summaries and user

profiles are specified in XML (col. 3 L19-22).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Revashatti and Ball in view of Sundaresan, in order to store

the user profile in an XML format.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because since XML is a

generalized extensible markup language, it has incredible potential to be the ultimate format for

data description, transport, and exchange (See Sundaresan, col. 2 L59-67, col. 1 L30-57).

As per claim 15, Revashatti in view of Ball does not disclose the process wherein the

offer file is an XML file stored on the user' computer.

Sundaresan, explicitly discloses the process of pattern matching and transforming

documents (col. 4 L29-40), wherein the content summaries and/or web documents and user

profiles are specified in XML (col. 3 L19-22, col. 5 L25 to col. 6 L25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Revashatti and Ball in view of Sundaresan, in order to

download the offer file in an XML format.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons

as set forth in claim 14.

As per claims 16-17, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 14-

15. Therefore claims 16-17 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 14-15.

4.   Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Revashetti et al. (hereinafter Revashatti, US 6,230,199 B1) in view of Ball et al. (hereinafter

Ball, US 5,860,071), and further in view of Jacobi et al. (hereinafter Jacobi, US 6,317,722 B1).

As per claim 18, Revashatti and Ball does not disclose the process of assigning user-

defined weightings to the data in the profile file to indicate specified fields that are regarded as

being of particular significance; and taking said weightings into account when applying the

matching rules in the offer file to the profile file in order to select one or more services from the

offer file.

Jacobi, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of assigning user-

defined weightings to the data in the profile file to indicate specified fields that are regarded as

being of particular significance; and taking said weightings into account when applying the

matching rules in the offer file to the profile file in order to select one or more services from the

offer file (fig. 1, fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 3 L19-30, col. 8 L7-59, col.11, lines 27-61).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Revashatti and Ball in view of Jacobi in order to assign a

value to particular area of interest and to receive services based on the ranking in order to receive

information of area of interest (Jacobi, col. 11, lines 27-61).

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have ensured the items and/or services in the profile with the rating would be included in the recommendations that are ultimately presented to the user (Jacobi, col. 3 L19-30).

As per claim 19, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 18. Therefore claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 18.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.   Herz, US Patent No. 6,460,036: System for providing Customized Electronic newspapers and target advertisements.

b.   Skillen et al., US Patent No. 6,098,065: Associative Search Engine.

c.   Tso et al., US Patent No. 6,047,327: System for Distributing Electronic information to a target group of users.

d.   Danneels, US 6,944,817 B1: Method and Apparatus for local generation of web pages.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-

5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kamal Divecha/

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
September 20, 2007.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100